

11

Emotion and Hope: Constructive Concepts for Complex Times

MICHAEL FULLAN

Pessimism is a very easy way out when you're considering what life really is because pessimism is a short view of life. If you look at what is happening around us today and what has happened since you were born, you can't help but feel that life is a terrible complexity of problems and elusiveness of one sort or another. . . . It is very much easier to be tragic than it is to be comic. I have known people to embrace the tragic view of life, and it is a cop-out. They simply feel rotten about everything, and that is terribly easy.

—Robertson Davies, *Canadian novelist*
(In *Csikszenmihalyi* 1996)

It is easy to be pessimistic about educational reform. There are many legitimate reasons to be discouraged. From a rational-technical point of view, the conclusion that large-scale reform is a hopeless proposition seems justified. Like Andy Hargreaves, in the opening chapter

of this Yearbook, I argue in this chapter that the emotional side of change has been either ignored or miscast. By examining emotions and change from a different perspective, we not only gain insights about the dynamics of change, but we also find new understandings of how to make change work more constructively. The moral and the technical begin to fuse, instead of being two ships passing in the night.

I start with a brief summary of the seemingly intractable problems of change—which could easily lead one to give up. I then rebuild the argument on a different premise starting first with the individual, and then moving to the group and the organization—a premise in which emotion and hope play a prominent but not Pollyannaish role. Wishful thinking or blind hopefulness are no more useful than cynicism.

Technical planning has not worked in educational change. Political pressure has failed to make a difference. Because moral exhortation falls short, is there a way of going deeper that leads to motivating and mobilizing even the most discouraged? I think there is. The question is whether in rethinking the place of emotion and hope in change, we can actually come up with a more effective route to working with complex change.

After examining emotion and hope at the individual and group levels, I turn to their implications for understanding and acting on constructive educational change. I will attempt to demonstrate that the more basic concepts of emotion and hope in human affairs provide a more profound explanation of why educational reform works when (in the small number of cases) it does. These deeper understandings, I will argue, are absolutely essential for sustaining and spreading constructive change.

THE PROBLEMS OF EDUCATIONAL CHANGE

Among the fundamental problems of educational change are (1) the growing and deepening alienation among teachers; (2) the balkanization and burnout of passionate reform-minded teachers; and (3) the overwhelming multiplicity of unconnected, fragmented change initiatives.

Anyone who spends time in public schools can feel the growing and deepening malaise among educators, whether it stems from a sense on the part of teachers that the public and the government do not care about them, or from an overwhelming sense of despair that the problems are insurmountable and worsening. Ken Dryden says it all

year in Kennedy Secondary School outside metro Toronto observing in classrooms and talking with teachers and students. Dryden (1995) writes this about a history teacher:

Rick learned a great lesson in humility. . . . He has a teacher's need to help kids. . . . He has the urge to personalize every kid's success and failure, feel the highs, suffer the lows, but by now he knows he is no savior. So much is going on in each kid's life, every story is so complicated. He is just one small brush stroke on a large canvas (p. 84).

No matter how hard they tried, says Dryden, teachers could not get past the "front row," reaching only a small percentage of the kids.

On the opposite side of the world, Bishop and Mulford (1996) subtitle their article on empowerment in four Australian schools "They Don't Really Care." Teachers talked about the impersonal government as the "they" out there:

They don't really care. It's purely a numbers and monetary game. I wouldn't mind so much if there was a purpose or master plan. Pressure and stress are up, and I'm not convinced that the government has the best interests of the kids at heart.

For large numbers of the teaching profession, the pressure of the job has taken the joy out of teaching.

At the same time, a significant minority of teachers has been attracted to specific reform initiatives and networks. There is less documentation on the effects of these heroic efforts, but the signs are not encouraging. Robert Fried (1995)—another author close to front-line teachers—concludes that "passionate teachers" are becoming exhausted in the face of "apathy and resistance" (from other teachers as well as from elsewhere). District Superintendent in New York City, Anthony Alvarado, reflects on his experience in District 2:

My strategy there was to make it possible for gifted and energetic people to create schools that represented their best ideas about teaching and learning and to let parents choose the schools that best matched their children's interest. We generated a lot of interest and a lot of good programs. But the main flaw with that strategy was that it never reached every teacher in every classroom; it focused on those who showed energy and commitment to change. So, after a while, improvement slowed down as we ran out of energetic and committed people. Many of the programs became inward-looking instead of trying to find new ways to do things (Elmore and Burney 1996, p. 14).

Elmore (1995) discusses the fatal in-built self-defeating nature of going only with the flow of like-minded reformers:

The first step serious reformers typically take involves gathering up the faithful and concentrating them in one place in order to form a cohesive community of like-minded practitioners. In the case of the progressives, reformers started schools that embodied their ideas; in the case of the curriculum projects, reformers identified early adopters of their new curricula as exemplars of success. This strategy immediately isolates the teachers who are most likely to change from those who are least likely to embrace reform. This dynamic creates a social barrier between the two, virtually guaranteeing that the former will not grow in number and the latter will continue to believe that exemplary teaching requires extraordinary resources in an exceptional environment (p. 17).

As satisfying and romantic as this might be in the short view, balkanized reformers eventually burnout leaving behind more cynicism and even greater gaps between "reformers and resisters." The inevitable long-run result of such a strategy is ironically to reduce the number of teachers committed to reform.

A third counterproductive problem, which appears in the guise of reform, is the presence of a multiplicity of change initiatives that actually make matters worse. Bryk and his colleagues (1993) put it this way:

A natural concomitant to the multiplicity of the programs, however, is that they are often uncoordinated and may even be counterproductive in terms of student learning. The addition of new programs on top of the old ones may result in a disjointed and fragmented set of experiences for students. . . . Much of school life seems to follow an endless cycle of soliciting funds, implementing new initiatives, and then going out to solicit more funds for even newer initiatives to replace current ones (p. 26).

Similarly, the increased intrusive scrutiny of the performance of schools and teachers is leaving many teachers emotionally drained, with feelings of confusion, anxiety, and professional inadequacy (Jeffrey and Woods, in press). What is a teacher to do? It feels right to be alienated. It seems hopeless to engage in the moral martyrdom of undertaking exhausting reforms against the grain. And the presence of a continuous stream of superficial, unconnected innovations justifies the conclusion that the system does not know what it is doing either. In short, current strategies—top-down, bottom-up, or sideways—don't work. We need to step back from this conundrum and approach

it differently, more basically, and as usual in postmodern times more paradoxically.

EMOTION AND HOPE: THE INDIVIDUAL

What do you do when you are faced with a lost cause that is of great importance? Richard Farson (1996), in *Management of the Absurd*, provides a novel entry point in recalling a line from one of Frank Capra's movies from the thirties, *Mr. Smith Goes to Washington*. James Stewart, who plays a young man just elected to the Senate, receives the absurd advice from his father that "lost causes are the only ones worth fighting for."

The state of educational reform is a prime candidate for the lost-cause category because none of the current strategies being employed results in substantial, widespread change. The first step toward liberation, in my view, is the realization that we are facing a lost cause. Paradoxically, as we shall see, this stance offers the only hope of making sustained progress. Moreover, the logic and the emotion of it makes perfect sense.

We all know smart people who do dumb things (Feinberg and Tarant 1995), and that many people of modest intelligence are quite successful. The difference, Coleman (1995) argues, is the degree to which an individual possesses *emotional intelligence*, which includes "self-control, zeal and persistence, and the ability to motivate oneself" (p. xii). Self-control and empathy, says Coleman, are at the heart of emotional intelligence. Moreover, Damasio (1994) presents compelling evidence that emotions are indispensable for rational decisions because they inform and narrow the range of choices in solving problems and making decisions. Cognitive intelligence is an advantage, but it is especially so when it combines with emotional maturity. The combination of heart and head is crucial to effectiveness.

Given the complexity and chaotic conditions of postmodern life, emotional development is crucial to survival:

Much evidence testifies that people who are emotionally adept—who know and manage their own feelings well, and who read and deal effectively with other people's feelings—are at an advantage in any domain of life, whether romance and intimate relationships or picking up the unspoken rules that govern success in organizational politics. People with well-developed emotional skills are also more likely to be content and effective in their lives, mastering the habits of mind that foster their own productivity; people who can-

not marshal some control over their emotional life fight inner battles that sabotage their ability for focused work and clear thought (Coleman 1995, p. 36).

Remember the metaphorical lost cause, or Csikszentmihalyi's (1990) observation that "frustration is deeply woven into the fabric of life" (p. 7). This is the lot of teachers. The more they care, the more anxious they get. The more that they become emotionally detached, the poorer the decisions they make. Understanding the intimate two-way link between emotion and hope is a powerful insight. Hope is not a naive, sunny view of life. It is the capacity not to panic in tight situations, to find ways and resources to address difficult problems:

From the perspective of emotional intelligence, having hope means that one will not give in to overwhelming anxiety. . . . Indeed, people who are hopeful evidence less depression than others as they maneuver through life in pursuit of their goals, are less anxious in general, and have fewer emotional distresses (Coleman 1995, p. 87).

It is well known that prolonged stress is unhealthy—deeply physiologically unhealthy because it undermines the immune system. We think less explicitly that hope or optimism (especially combined with other conditions described in the next section) can lead to better health. People who are optimistic and hopeful are more resourceful and do better under difficult circumstances (Coleman 1995, p. 177). Not only do they avoid the costs of perennial pessimism, but they gain the benefits of hopefulness. It is important to emphasize that I am linking hope and purpose. Hopeful people are not unaware of reality or superficially happier. They are indeed hopeful in the face of lost causes and other intractable problems.

It would be easy to draw misleading conclusions from this description. Be happy, refuse to worry, if only more of us could be hopeful things would be all right. I am instead saying that the situation of change is profoundly problematic and that we are down to our last virtue: hope. We stand less of a chance by pursuing the techniques of innovation than we do by working on a deeper understanding of the complex interrelationships of emotion, hope, empathy, and moral purpose.

Let me take two more down-to-earth applications of this line of thought. Both are from the perspective of the individual—one as initiator of change, the other as recipient.

Why does Mintzberg (1994) say, "Never adopt a [management] technique by its usual name" (p. 27), and Farson (1996) state, "Once

you find a management technique that works, give it up" (p. 35). Because there is no silver bullet, no shortcut to reform, and because techniques devalue and disrespect emotions. The initiators of change must learn to put techniques in their place—they are at best tools in the service of a more fundamental set of relationships.

For example, assume you are a principal who is strongly committed to the increased use of technology. You are sincerely convinced that it is in the best interest of students to become technologically proficient. You see yourself as an innovator and change agent. In the old way of thinking—strategically and technically grounded—you might approach the situation along these lines:

I am sure that technology is one of the keys to the future for my students. Parents support it. I know that some teachers favor it, but others are going to be Luddites. How can I get some teacher leaders to support it? What kind of external resources and expertise can I generate to provide support and pressure to move forward? Maybe I can secure a few transfers and new appointments. My whole approach is advocacy and co-optation into an agenda that I am sure is right.

Now, let us assume that you, as principal, are schooled in the deeper insights about complex change. You are equally convinced that technology is critical, but you approach it differently. Cutting the story short, let's say that you are having a staff session in which you are about to show a video segment that portrays a highly successful technology-based school in action. Instead of showing it to make your case, you present it differently. You randomly ask one half of the staff to view the video with a "positive lens" noting what might be in it for them; you ask the other half of the staff to view it "negatively or critically" by identifying what might be problematic or potentially negative for them. If you are sincere, you have legitimized dissent. You have made it easy for staff to speak up about concerns (which would come out later anyway in more subtle and inaccessible ways). You listen carefully, suspending your own advocacy, because you know that some fundamental problems will be identified and that people's fears, real or imagined, will need to be examined carefully. This information may lead you to go back to the drawing board, to work with staff to address some preconditions, to proceed into action on a start small/think big basis, or to abandon high-profile technology in favor of a different approach.

In other words, with greater emotional intelligence and empathy, initiators of change learn from resisters. They know that emotion is energy. They know that

what is needed is to hear the discontent, not to judge it or deny it, but accept that it is what others perceive. The simple act of listening, of seeking to understand the nature of the discontent, is enough to begin to shift staff's perception. However, many managers refuse to listen because they fear the dissatisfaction is worse than it is or they do not see it as balanced by many positive views of the organization. Once they take the risk of listening they are often surprised by the good news which arrives along with the bad (Binney and Williams 1995, p. 104).

In essence I am saying that the role of enthusiasts has been overestimated, and the value of resisters has been missed. Enthusiasts can be helpful to be sure, but not if in the mid to long run they increase the gap between themselves as small isolated groups of reformers and the larger numbers of organizational members; and not if they turn out to be wrong because their ideas have not been subjected to critical scrutiny by nay-sayers who have a different point of view. The value of resisters, on the other hand, has been unappreciated. Resistant acts "often embody a form of good sense" (Gitlin and Margonis 1995).

Trying to manipulate or otherwise control the change process in order to minimize or eliminate resistance is not only futile, but it is exhausting:

A more successful process is "listening to those who seem to be resisters and seeking to understand what lies behind their resistance" (Binney and Williams 1995, pp. 111-112).

Finding a way to reconcile positive and negative emotion is the key to releasing energy for change. The initiator or leader of change who combines hope and empathy, even in the face of seemingly lost causes, has a much greater chance for breakthrough.

It is important to clarify, as is implicit in the above example, that hope is not connected only to "positive" emotion (see the opening chapter by Andy Hargreaves). Indeed, the opposite is the point in dealing with lost causes. Anger, sadness, frustration, anxiety, loss of control, dissatisfaction, discomfort—all inform hopefulness for the emotionally intelligent person. Because the emotionally effective person knows that complexity and diversity is endemic in postmodern society, and always brings disagreement and frustration, he or she approaches the problem

with that basic assumption. This is what Patrick Dolan (1994) was getting at when he observed:

In a school, where mistrust between the community and the administration is the major issue, you might begin to deal with it by making sure that parents were present at every major event, every meeting, every challenge. *Within the discomfort of that presence*, the learning and the healing could begin (p. 60, my emphasis).

Hopeful people have a greater capacity to deal with interpersonal discomfort, and believe they will get somewhere by staying with it. They know that despair, while sometimes justified, is ultimately self-destructive.

Perhaps it is one thing to have hope and empathy if you are in a leadership position, but what if you are the recipient of changes around you. (In fact, for the vast majority of changes we experience regardless of our station in life, we are recipients much more often than innovators of change.) The secret again is the stance toward life. If we try to implement all changes coming our way, we are naive and find ourselves in a state of constant overload and dependency. If we reject all changes because they are incoherent, we become victimized anyway.

The more effective orientation, which builds on what I have been saying so far, is captured by Howard Gardner (1995) in his incisive study of 11 *Leading Minds*. He summarizes some of the traits in his composite Exemplary Leader (E.L.):

Among the markers of the leader's personality, the most telling indication is a willingness to confront individuals in authority. Sometimes this confrontation is abrasive, but it need not be so. Rather, E.L. stands out in that she identifies with and feels herself to be a peer of an individual in a position of authority. To E.L., it therefore feels natural—or at least possible—to address that person directly. Moreover, E.L. has pondered the issues involved in a specific position of leadership and believes that her own insights are at least as well motivated and perhaps more likely to be effective than those of the person currently at the helm. Perhaps this feeling of confidence stems from the fact that E.L.'s proposed solutions to problems grow out of her own life circumstances and thus are more appropriate than solutions conceived in earlier times or in other places (p. 286).

Gardner proceeds to identify other traits: "E.L. stands out because of her concerns with moral issues" (p. 286); "another feature is the opportunity for reflection" and "the major reason that reflection is important is that a leader like E.L. must be able to see the big picture" (p. 287).

Similarly, Csikszentmihalyi's (1996) study of 91 creative individuals from different fields indicates that creative people do not accept at face value what comes at them:

[They] do not rush to define the nature of problems; they look at the situation from various angles first and leave the formulation undetermined for a long time. They consider different causes and reasons. They test their hunches about what really is going on, first in their own mind and then in reality. They try tentative solutions and check their success—and they are open to reformulating the problem if the evidence suggests they started out on the wrong path (p. 365).

Farson (1996), echoing Gardner's "willingness to confront others in authority," says that both in school and at home we are taught a reliance on authority, on the opinion of others. We are taught not to trust our emotions, that our emotions are our enemies and will get us into trouble (p. 150).

The same point, made more powerfully by Binney and Williams (1995), is that

intuition is important. Often people know what to do but can't articulate why. They have an instinct, a feeling that they ought to do something or behave in a certain way. So also with change. In our experience managers have a great deal of instinct and intuition about what works and what doesn't. If they feel it is OK to discuss openly what their instincts tell them, there is a huge well of insights to be drawn from (p. 49).

Suppressing intuition and emotion is a barrier to good judgment, and we need to give them both more space in dealing with complex change circumstances.

Gardner, Csikszentmihalyi, and others make it clear that the main purpose of their work is not to identify rarefied individuals, but to provide insights about leadership for everyone. Leadership with a small "l" has to do with how we all can exert greater control in the complexities of everyday experiences. The most important message is "how to find purpose and enjoyment in the chaos of existence" (Csikszentmihalyi 1996, p. 20). The answer must start with us as individuals. Being hopeful is a powerful resource in its own right, and it can be amplified tremendously in the group.

EMOTION AND HOPE: THE GROUP

We know at a common sense and experiential level that relationships matter a great deal, especially during times of intense change. We write about collaborative work attitudes and professional learning communities, but it is too easy for these to become abstract phrases. Once again, I believe that if we dig deeper into roles of emotion and hope in interpersonal relationships, we will gain a lasting understanding of how to deal with change more constructively.

Coleman (1995) provides a basic starting point:

Studies done over two decades involving more than 37,000 people show that social isolation—the sense that you have nobody with whom you can share your private feelings, have close contact—doubles the chances of sickness or death (p. 178).

If we link these findings to the iron law of change—that all change produces fear of the unknown, ambivalence, and anxiety—we begin to see what has to be done. Helping ourselves and other people better manage the upsetting feelings of change is the healthiest thing we can do.

Farson (1996) states it this way:

My experience tells me that people suffer most in their lives from failed or failing relationships—parental rejections, marital strife, difficulties with bosses—or from the lack of relationships—isolation, alienation, erosion of community. It follows, then, that the best way to deal with individuals may be to improve relationships (p. 91).

Along with moving to site-based management, rethinking staff development, assessment systems, and the like, the best way to deal with change may be “to improve relationships.” Because techniques abound (and they don’t work), because we have failed to work at the basics—human relationships—and because you cannot really “manage” relationships, many of us have concluded that managing change in a direct sense is a myth (see Binney and Williams 1995, Farson 1996, Stacey 1993). Paradoxically, to know that relationships cannot be managed directly frees us to pursue other approaches that create more powerful situations for dealing with the vicissitudes of complex change.

Change is learning, done under conditions of many real and perceived unknowns. In these circumstances prolonged isolation is bad, and interaction is essential. Binney and Williams (1995) observe that “if people work extensively in isolation, from their colleagues or the exter-

nal environment, there is a greater probability that they will find change more difficult to adjust to” because they will be less aware of what is going on inside and outside the organization (p. 125). They will be more unprepared for change. Interaction, on the other hand, is vital: “It is as a result of interaction that things can be seen differently, choices appear, and action is supported” (p. 145). To interact effectively requires individuals “who know and manage their own feelings well, and who read and deal effectively with other people’s feelings” (Coleman 1995, p. 36).

In the same way that crash diets don’t work, we must abandon the search for the quick fix. There is a consistent message in the new books on change:

- Have good ideas, but listen with empathy.
- Create time and mechanisms for personal and group reflection.
- Allow intuition and emotion a respected role.
- Work on improving relationships.
- Realize that hope, especially in the face of frustrations, is the last healthy virtue.

CONSTRUCTIVE EDUCATIONAL CHANGE

It is no accident that I have drawn very little up to this point on the educational change literature. I wanted to establish the basic human concepts of emotion and hope as a foundation for a deeper understanding of constructive educational change. I maintain, in this section, that such a perspective provides us with a more powerful, lasting, and action-generative basis for interpreting recent research on constructive change.

Despite the consistency and specificity of research findings on the impact of collaborative work cultures and professional learning communities, we do not seem to be gaining ground on educational reform. Understanding these successes as charged with emotion and hope infuses them with more meaning, and may make them more memorable and attractive. Let us first consider briefly the essence of these findings. Newmann and Wehlage (1995) provide a concise summary of their studies of “successful school restructuring” in more than 1,500 schools. They define success as school reform efforts that make a positive difference in student learning and performance, measured both by newer standards of performance as well as by traditional achievement tests. Successful schools focused on “authentic” pedagogy (teaching

that requires students to think, to develop an in-depth understanding, and to apply academic learning to important realistic problems), and student learning. They achieved this in two main ways:

1. Greater Organizational Capacity

The most successful schools were those that used restructuring tools to help them function as professional communities. That is, they found a way to channel staff and student efforts toward a clear, commonly shared purpose for student learning (Newmann and Wehlage 1995, p. 3).

2. Greater External Support

We found that external agencies helped schools to focus on student learning and to enhance organizational capacity through three strategies: setting standards for learning of high intellectual quality; providing sustained, schoolwide staff development; and using de-regulation to increase school autonomy (p. 4).

In short, vibrant internal learning communities dynamically plugged into two-way relationships with external networks made the difference. Corroborating evidence on the critical combination of internal and external learning is mounting (see, for example, Elmore and Burney 1996, Louis and Kruse 1995, and Spillane and Thompson 1996).

However, it takes a careful, I would say deeper, reading of these studies to grasp their full meaning. Collaborative work of the kind described in these studies embodies socioemotional support as well as technical assistance. It creates a culture, as Joe MacDonald (in press) observes, of "lateral accountability," which "puts more peer pressure and accountability on staff who may not have carried out their fair share, but it can also ease the burden on teachers who have worked hard in isolation but who felt unable to help some students" (Newmann and Wehlage 1995, p. 31).

These studies show the folly of searching for quick managerial fixes. Elmore and Burney (1996) talk about Superintendent Anthony Alvarado's approach in District 2 in New York City:

Alvarado worries that District 2's approach to instructional improvement will be seen by outsiders as a collection of management principles, rather than as a culture based on norms of commitment, mutual care, and concern. Implementing the principles without the culture, he argues, will not work, because management alone cannot affect people's deeply held values (p. 22).

The strategies used in District 2 consist of a highly interactive and interpersonal network of learning and assessing progress.

Griffin's (1996) study of teachers in 13 restructuring schools also describes the personal and interpersonal nature of emotion and hope at work. The teachers in Griffin's research were characterized by

- A sense of obligation/urgency: "This urgency is rooted in the teachers' belief that schools can make a difference in students' lives, present and future, and that this belief must be played out against the complex tapestry of the larger society" (p. 3).
- An eagerness to recognize and act upon the "problems" they encountered.
- Retreat from beliefs that others can solve one's personal/professional problems.
- A decision to redesign their use of time to understand, decide, act, reflect together.
- A greater sense of future possibility.
- A concern for everyday life and the school's relation to it.
- A commitment and understanding of the interdependence of people, events, ideas, and agencies (Griffin 1996).

In their investigation of "local capacity" to implement mathematics and science reforms in nine school districts, Spillane and Thompson (1996) found that on the surface all nine districts appeared to be aligning their curriculum with state policy, but on closer examination only three were engaged in substantive reform. The now familiar list of differences in these three districts included different conceptions and use of time, staffing, materials, knowledge, commitment and disposition, professional networks, and trust and collaboration. In turn, Spillane and Thompson organize these characteristics into three main categories:

1. Physical capital (material resources).
2. Human capital (commitment to reform and disposition to learn by administrators and teacher leaders).
3. Social capital (relationships and networks internal and external to the district).

Once again we see the centrality of individual motivation and social relationships.

We are now in a position to be more explicit about the main argument that connects emotion and hope to sustained reform in a way that provides a deeper explanation and a more powerful reform agenda. First, in many respects, the experience of teachers with reform is gener-

ating deep negative emotions and a sense of hopelessness, either because they are on the defensive from external attack or because they have been part of small groups of reformers who have burned themselves out. What makes this situation so serious is that it is so fundamentally flawed and self-defeating.

Second, the first step toward liberation is the recognition, on the one hand, that persistent negative emotions lead to ever greater individual and organizational illness and diminution of capacity and, on the other hand, that being hopeful is a critical resource, especially in the face of seeming lost causes. This realization contains a powerful insight for breaking free of a vicious cycle of despair.

Third, the research findings of successful reform just reviewed should be understood as providing, at least temporarily, the very conditions that enable hope to be experienced—again in the face of daunting problems.

The point is not that these conditions represent the elusive solutions that we have been seeking, but rather that hope is to be especially prized when it is fragile. Put another way, it is easy to be hopeful when things are rosy; it is essential to be hopeful when they are not. Holding onto hope in difficult situations is a necessary (although not a sufficient condition for longer term survival).

Fourth, reformers are ill-advised to work only within the balkanized cocoons of like-minded individuals. We stand more of a chance of getting somewhere if we confront differences earlier in the process, working through the discomfort of diversity, than we do if we attempt to work in sealed-off cultures.

Fifth, and this is crucial, to stay hopeful under negative conditions is not to be politically quiescent. It is not only possible, but indeed essential, to work on the connection between hopefulness and the structural conditions that promote it. The hopeful change agent that I am talking about is painfully aware that the current working conditions of teachers work against reform. The development of collaborative work cultures under very different internal structural conditions (more

grouping of students, and teachers; more time for teachers to work together; close collaboration with parents and communities; redistribution of resources) and very different external relationships (standards of performance and accountability; access to networks of ideas and professional learning) must become part and parcel of the working agenda of hopeful reformers. This stance includes pushing for, demanding, and expecting new policy frameworks to alter the incentives and structural conditions that currently frustrate reform.

In short, hope has a dual interconnected track in which reformers work with students, parents, and other educators, even when it seems like a lost cause, and participate in the politics of altering the structural conditions of schools so that reform and quality have a greater chance of being built into the daily experiences of the majority of educators and students.

EMOTION, HOPE, AND POSITIVE CHANGE

Society is more complex, more chaotic, more nonlinear than ever before. The demands on schools are ever more multiple and fragmented. The boundaries between schools, their communities, and society are more permeable (see Hargreaves and Fullan, in press, and the chapters in this Yearbook, especially those by David Elkind [Chapter 3], Jeannie Oakes and her colleagues [Chapter 2], and Andy Hargreaves [Chapter 1]).

To survive in these circumstances requires a greater individual and group capacity. This capacity at its core is to be able to handle emotions and hope differently. Frustration, disagreement, intractable problems are common fare. Working together under these circumstances takes on radically different meaning and urgency. It's not a matter of having trusting relationships with like-minded people. As Elmore (1995) puts it, "Small groups of self-selected reformers apparently seldom influence their peers" (p. 20). If we are to get anywhere on a larger scale, we have to take on the "negative" emotions. Hope is not blind. It recognizes that disagreement and matters of power are central to working through the discomfort of diversity (see also Henry 1996).

The successful school restructuring efforts described earlier may not be enduring and may not spread (and that indeed is the problem). The argument in this chapter is that we have a greater chance of capitalizing on these findings if we understand the roles of emotion and hope that underlie successful individuals and groups, and if we strive to create the structural conditions that challenge and help create hopefulness. I contend that these successes occurred precisely because emotion and hope were channeled in promising directions, and that if we fail to grasp this more basic understanding, we will not be able to sustain such efforts let alone go beyond them.

Being hopeful and taking action in the face of important lost causes (improving education being the one in question) may be less emotionally draining than being in a permanent state of despair. There

is also evidence that it may be one of the few routes to success still available to us. To be hopeful is not to be naive, but to struggle to move ahead. Judge Rosalie Abella (1996)—born in a refugee camp in Stuttgart, Germany, on July 14, 1946—may have said it best: "There was nothing expected and everything hoped for."

REFERENCES

- Abella, R. (1996). From her acceptance speech for an Honorary Doctoral Degree from the University of Toronto.
- Binney, G., and C. Williams. (1995) *Leaning into the Future*. London: Nicholas Brealey.
- Bishop, P., and W. Mulford. (1996). "Empowerment in Four Australian Primary Schools." *International Journal of Educational Reform* 5, 2: 193-204.
- Bryk, A., J. Easton, D. Kerbow, S. Rollow, and P. Sebrig. (1993). *A View from the Elementary School: The State of Reform in Chicago*. Chicago: The Consortium on Chicago School Reform.
- Csikszentmihalyi, M. (1990). *Flow: The Psychology of Optimal Experience*. New York: Harper & Collins.
- Csikszentmihalyi, M. (1996). *Creativity*. New York: Harper & Collins.
- Damasio, A. (1994). *Descartes' Error*. New York: Grosset Putnam.
- Dolan, P. (1994). *Restructuring Our Schools*. Kansas City, Mo.: Systems & Organizations.
- Dryden, K. (1995). *In School*. Toronto: McClelland.
- Elmore, R. (1995). "Getting to Scale with Good Educational Practice." *Harvard Educational Review* 66, 1: 1-26.
- Elmore, R., and D. Burney. (1996). "Staff Development and Instructional Improvement: Community District 2, New York City." Paper prepared for the National Commission of Teaching and America's Future.
- Farson, R. (1996). *Management of the Absurd*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Feinberg, M., and J. Tarrant. (1995). *Why Smart People Do Dumb Things*. New York: Fireside.
- Fried, R. (1995). *The Passionate Teacher*. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Gardner, H. (1995). *Leading Minds*. New York: Basic Books.
- Gitlin, A., and F. Margolis. (1995). "The Political Aspects of Reform." *American Journal of Education* 103: 377-405.
- Goleman, D. (1995). *Emotional Intelligence*. New York: Bantam Books.
- Griffin, G. (1996). "Restructuring Schools: Implications for Teacher Education." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New York.
- Hargreaves, A., and M. Fullan. (In press). *What's Worth Fighting for Out There*. New York: Teachers College Press; Toronto: Ontario Public School Teachers' Federation.
- Henry, M. (1996). *Parent-School Collaboration*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Jeffrey, B., and P. Woods. (In press). "Feeling Deprofessionalized." *The Cambridge Journal of Education*.
- Louis, K., and S. Kruse. (1995). *Professionalism and Community*. Thousand Oaks, Calif.: Corwin Publishers.
- MacDonald, J. (In press). *Redesigning Schools*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Mintzberg, H. (1994). *The Rise and Fall of Strategic Planning*. New York: Free Press.
- Newmann, F., and G. Wehlage. (1995). *Successful School Restructuring*. Madison, Wis.: Center on Organization and Restructuring of Schools.
- Spillane, J., and C. Thompson. (1996). "Reconstructing Conceptions of Local Capacity." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New York.
- Stacey, R. (1993). *Managing the Unknowable*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

